10/566128

## IAP9 Rec'd PCTYPTO 25 JAN 2006

## WRITTEN REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCH AUTHORITY

International File No.: PCT/DE2004/001482

Field No. II Priority

1. The following document has not been submitted:

Copy of the previous application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).

Field No. V. Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty Yes: Claims 2,3

No: Claims 1,4,5

Inventive Step Yes: Claims 2,3

No: Claims 1,4,5

Industrial Applicability Yes: Claims 1-5

No: Claims

2. Citations and Explanations:

see appended sheet

## WRITTEN REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCH AUTHORITY (SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET)

International File No.: PCT/DE2004/001482

## Re: Point V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

- Reference is made to the following document:
  D1: DE 101 49 332 A (ROBERT BOSCH GMBH) April 30, 2003 (2003-04-30)
- The present application does not fulfill the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT because the object of Claim 1 is not novel in terms of Article 33(2) PCT.

Document 1 discloses a method for digital data transmission from a sensor to a control unit (Claim 1) (the references in parentheses refer to this document, see paragraphs [0015], [0016] and Figure 1), the sensor values of the sensor being divided for data transmission at different resolutions, the sensor values forming a range of values including successive sensor values, and the first range of values for data transmission being divided as a function of a variable relevant for the control unit. (Column 2, Lines 61-65.)

2.1 The same reasoning applies correspondingly to independent Claims 4 and 5.

Document D1 discloses the use of a transmitter module (8) in a sensor (7) and the use of a receiver module (2) in a

control unit (1) for executing the method according to Claim 1; see Point 2.

The object of Claims 4 and 5 is therefore not novel. (Article 33(2) PCT).

2.2 The feature combination recited in dependent Claims 2 and 3 is neither known from the present related art, nor is it suggested by it. The reasons for this are:

It is neither known from the related art, nor is it suggested that the variable is a second range of values of threshold values of a triggering algorithm for restraining means.